

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/449,321	11/24/1999	GREGG A. BONIKOWSKI	XER20308-D/9	6134	
7590 09/13/2005			EXAMINER		
	SHARPE III ESQ	BRINICH, STEPHEN M			
FAY SHARPE FAGAN MINNICH & MCKEE LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
7TH FLOOR			2624		
CLEVELAND, OH 441142518			DATE MAIL ED: 00/12/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/449,321	BONIKOWSKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Stephen M. Brinich	2624		

7.447001 y 7.104011	03/443,321	BONNOVORIETA	· <b>-</b> •				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stephen M. Brinich	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 August 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In</li> </ul>							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	·	` ,					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
appeal; and/or	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Attachment</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and	1 77		(570) 004)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-6 and 9-14</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n or the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacr	iea.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)13. Other:							

Application/Control Number: 09/449,321 Page 2

Art Unit: 2624

#### DETAILED ACTION

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claims 1 & 10-11 (and dependent claims 4-6 & 12-14),

Applicant argues (8/12/05 Response: page 6, lines 11-24 and page
6, line 32 - page 7, line 8) that the amended claims clarify
that the "sample job" is distinct and disjoint from the "main
job". Applicant further argues in support of this point (8/12/05
Response: page 6, lines 25-31) that the separate delivery
recited in dependent claim 9 is a further indication of the
separation between the "sample job" and the "main job".

However, Gauronski et al (5164842) describes the production of an sample job that is clearly distinct from the main job (e.g. column 7, lines 7-8, "...where the operator desires to proof a job before the job is run,..."; column 7, lines 37-38, "...the proof job is inserted into the succession of jobs... [i.e. it is a separate and distinct job in itself]").

#### Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Application/Control Number: 09/449,321

Art Unit: 2624

Page 3

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich Examiner

Art Unit 2624

August 30, 2005

TOMASO,
TOMASO,
PRIMARY EXAMINER